

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/627,870	SPROGIS, DAVID H.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James W Myhre	3622	NW

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) James W Myhre. (3) David Sprogs.
 (2) Bill Hilton. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 26 October 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Rabowsky (6,141,530).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicant discussed the invention and what was deemed to be the novelty thereof. The Examiner reviews the above newly found prior art and discussed how it read on at least the current Claim 1. The Examiner also noted that Claim 1 did not seem to include the limitation that the advertisements were selected and scheduled in a targeted manner as alluded to by the Applicant. It was agreed that the Applicant would await an office action by the Examiner before submitting an amendment, if necessary..